UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/701,265	11/04/2003	Brenda F. Baker	ISIS-5300	7033
	7590 10/31/200 WASHBURN LLP		EXAMINER	
CIRA CENTRE	E, 12TH FLOOR		PITRAK, JENNIFER S	
2929 ARCH STREET PHILADELPHIA, PA 19104-2891			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1635	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			10/31/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)				
	10/701,265	BAKER ET AL.				
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit				
	JENNIFER PITRAK	1635				
The MAILING DATE of this communication app Period for Reply	ears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence address				
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DA - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period w - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tim vill apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from cause the application to become ABANDONE	lely filed the mailing date of this communication. (35 U.S.C. § 133).				
Status						
1)⊠ Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>09 Ju</u>	ılv 2008					
	action is non-final.					
	, _					
	closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.					
Disposition of Claims						
4)⊠ Claim(s) <u>120,121,124-128,131-133,136-154 and 157-167</u> is/are pending in the application.						
4a) Of the above claim(s) <u>See Continuation Sheet</u> is/are withdrawn from consideration.						
5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.						
6)⊠ Claim(s) <u>120,121,124-128,131-133,136-154 and 157-167</u> is/are rejected.						
7) Claim(s) is/are objected to.						
8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or	r election requirement.					
Application Papers	·					
9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner. 10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.						
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).						
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d). 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.						
.—	annior. Note the attached office	7.00.001 01 1011111 1 0 102.				
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119						
 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received. 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received. 						
Attachment(s) 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date	4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail Da 5) Notice of Informal P 6) Other:	ite				

Continuation of Disposition of Claims: Claims withdrawn from consideration are 125,126,128,131-133,141,142,144-147,150-154 and 157-167.

DETAILED ACTION

Remarks

In the response filed 07/09/2008, Applicant canceled claims 122, 123, 129, 130, 134, 135, 155, and 156 and amended claim 120. Claims 125, 126, 128, 131-133, 141, 142, 144-147, 150-154, and 157-167 are withdrawn from consideration because they are directed to non-elected subject matter. Claims 120, 121, 124, 127, 136-140, 143, 148, and 149 are under examination.

The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.

Priority

Applicant's claim for the benefit of a prior-filed application under 35 U.S.C. 119(e) or under 35 U.S.C. 120, 121, or 365(c) is acknowledged and granted in view of applicant's arguments filed 01/09/08. Therefore, the instant claims are afforded the benefit of application 08/870,608, filed 06/06/97.

Claim Objections - withdrawn

The objection to claim 122 is moot because the claim has been canceled.

Application/Control Number: 10/701,265 Page 3

Art Unit: 1635

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112 - withdrawn

The rejection of claims 120-124, 127, and 136-138 under 35 USC § 112 first paragraph has been obviated by the amendments to the claims. Therefore, the rejection is withdrawn.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102 - withdrawn

The rejection of claims 120, 121, 124, 127, and 136-138 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being clearly anticipated by Crooke (2000, U.S. Patent 6,107,094) is withdrawn in view of applicant's arguments filed 01/09/08.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103 - withdrawn

The rejection of claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Crooke (2000) and Elbashir, *et al.* (2001) has been obviated by the amendments to the claims. Therefore, the rejection is withdrawn.

Double Patenting - maintained

Claims 139, 140, 143, 148, and 149 are rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 4, 7, and 8 of U.S. Patent No. 6,107,094 ('094) and over claim 29 of U.S. Patent 5,898,031. This rejection is maintained for the reasons of record.

Double Patenting - new

The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible

Art Unit: 1635

harassment by multiple assignees. A nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting rejection is appropriate where the conflicting claims are not identical, but at least one examined application claim is not patentably distinct from the reference claim(s) because the examined application claim is either anticipated by, or would have been obvious over, the reference claim(s). See, e.g., *In re Berg*, 140 F.3d 1428, 46 USPQ2d 1226 (Fed. Cir. 1998); *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) or 1.321(d) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent either is shown to be commonly owned with this application, or claims an invention made as a result of activities undertaken within the scope of a joint research agreement.

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

Claims 120, 121, 124, 127, 136-138 are provisionally rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 333-359 of copending Application No. 09/479,783. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because the claims of application 09/479,783 are to compositions comprising duplexes that are of the same size (17-25 nucleotides), that comprise the same modifications (2' fluoro and 2'-OCH3), and are gapmers just as are the instant claims. The limitations of at least a 4-nucleoside gap and of two- to seven-nucleoside wings are not claimed in the '783 application, but are taught by the specification (see figure 1). Thus, the instant claims are obvious over those of Application No. 09/479,783.

This is a <u>provisional</u> obviousness-type double patenting rejection because the conflicting claims have not in fact been patented.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to JENNIFER PITRAK whose telephone number is (571)270-3061.

The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday, 8:30AM-5:00PM, EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, James (Doug) Schultz can be reached on 571-272-0763. The fax phone number for

the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent

Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications

may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished

applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR

system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR

system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would

like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated

information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Jennifer Pitrak Examiner

Art Unit 1635

/Tracy Vivlemore/

Primary Examiner, Art Unit 1635